



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,459	03/31/2004	Diane L. Peterson	01002-21910.NP..	6397
20551	7590	01/29/2007	EXAMINER	
THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP. 8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200 SANDY, UT 84070			SILBERMANN, JOANNE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3611		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,459	PETERSON, DIANE L.
	Examiner Joanne Silbermann	Art Unit 3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 10-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This claim does not read as a complete sentence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-14 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard, US #3,983,646 in view of Benderly, US #6,422,037.
5. Howard teaches a coin having first and second metallic layers 12, 13, secured with adhesive (column 2 line 39). The layers may include indicia (column 3 lines 34-35). Howard does not teach engraved indicia.
6. Benderly teaches a coin having a metal substrate with engraved indicia thereon (see Abstract). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize engraved indicia on the coin so as to provide an image that will not be easily or inadvertently removed.

7. Benderly also teaches using gold or other precious metals as well as less precious metals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize gold or any other well known precious material to produce a coin of a desired value. Also, it would have been obvious to choose any well known material since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

8. Regarding the method of making the first coin layer, the method of forming a device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

9. Benderly also teaches bezel 11 and glass layer 19 (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to utilize such a bezel and glass layer in the device of Howard so as to provide protection for the coin, as is taught by Benderly.

10. Howard describes the coin as being spendable at a particular location (see Background) and the image is considered to be memorabilia.

11. Howard and Benderly do not specifically teach the image as being a serial number or as representing an event from history. This however, is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to place any decorative or informative indicia on the coin so that a user would know its value, or may keep it as a memento (such as state quarters). Also, patentable novelty cannot be principally predicated on mere printed matter and arrangements thereof, but

must reside basically in physical structure. *In re Montgomery*, 102 USPQ 248 (CCPA 1954).

12. Regarding claim 17, Howard teaches using a plurality of coins (column 3 lines 54-63).

13. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard and Benderly as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Chan, US #6,948,999.

14. Howard teaches a third coin layer 11c as shown in Figure 1c. Howard and Benderly, as discussed above, do not teach the use of precious stones, however this is well known in the art. Chan teaches the idea of placing jewels around a display. It would have been obvious to utilize precious or semi-precious stones around the display so as to create a more attractive, decorative coin.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 22 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. Applicant argues that the combination of Howard and Benderly is not made by the same methods as Applicant's invention. As stated in the rejection, the method of making the article is not given patentable weight in the article claims.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3611

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Silbermann whose telephone number is 571-272-6653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Joanne Silbermann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

js
24 January 2007